

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/534,726

Applicant(s)

LOHRAY ET AL.

Examiner

NIZAL S. CHANDRAKUMAR

Art Unit

1625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NIZAL S. CHANDRAKUMAR.

(3) _____

(2) Eric Sinn.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 04 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's request with regards to issuance of a second Restriction Requirement was confirmed. The preferred claim 9 and dependent claims are to be included in the new Restriction Requirement. Also to be included in the requirement are claims that contain non-statutory language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/NC/